DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 109 565 CG 009 972

AUTHOR Krasner, Leonard
TITLE The Classroom as a Planned Environment.
PUB DATE 2 Apr 75
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, D.C., March 30-April 3, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Objectives; *Behavior Change; *Classroom Environment; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Students; Environmental Influences; *Environmental Research; Models; Speeches; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

This document presents a theoretical model of the classroom. It puts the model in historical perspective, discusses research relevant to the model, and discusses the implications of the model for subsequent application. It further reviews implications of training of professionals in the fields of psychology and education such as teachers, counselors, clinical and school psychologists, and researchers to work within the model and to influence subsequent directions of the educational process. The model views the classroom as a total environment planned by the teacher with advice and suggestions from students, parents, researchers, school administration, and guided by mandated state curriculum. The author describes the classroom as a "planned environment" in terms of the influences of the model, its background, and its consequences. Examples of such a model at work in a normal elementary classroom are provided. (Author/PC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED104565

The Classroom As A Planned Environment

Leonard Krasner

State University of New York - Stony Brook, New York

Division E Invited Address
American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting

Washington, D. C.

April 2, 1975

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CG 009 972

I am most grateful for having been invited to present the Division E address. When I received the invitation, I was most pleased, puzzled, and then anxious. What could I possibly have to say at a meeting of educational researchers? This resulted in intensive introspection and other assorted cognitive activities which forced me to become aware of a series of paradoxes in my professional life, which I must share with you for they have become both the basis and the context for my discussion of the classroom as a planned environment.

The first paradox involves my own role identification. I have been trained and have functioned as a clinical psychologist for about 25 years. I have even served in the august role as Director of a clinical psychology training program. I have just completed a new edition of an abnormal psychology textbook. Yet in spite of these unimpeachable credentials for dealing with pathology and deviance, within the past several years I have found myself training "participant-observers" in nice normal classrooms. I am a member of the University Policy Board developing competency-based teacher education. I am developing a resource center primarily for teachers. Graduate students who are working with me are doing research on procedures for training teachers and children in elementary school classrooms. I am working on a book on education. Have I switched fields? Not at all. I continually reiterate that I am still training clinical psychologists (the graduate students who are working in the school context have their work approved as clinical internships). Yet I realize that I am looked upon as a bit strange by my clinical colleagues.

There are other paradoxes. My past work and model identification has been with behavior modification--the slogan of our times. Yet in the last few years I have been working with my wife and a group of other teachers who identify their approach to the classroom, unashamedly and unabashedly, as"open education." As a participant-observer in the history of behavior modification for many years, I have been taping interviews with most of the major influencers in this field. More recently I have been taping interviews with influencers in the field of progressive education for whom behavior modification is anathema, and they let me know that in no uncertain terms. Colleagues give me quizzical looks as I indicate that my studies involve a linkage of behavior modification and open education.

Another paradox evolves around a label. When asked what label I was attaching to my current endeavors (because everything in our society needs a label), I picked the term "environmental design." Response to this term included complaints that the term was already used by architects or those working with "human factors" or even that the School of Home Economics at Cornell had recently changed its name to School of Environmental Design and thus was dealing with Home Economics? One repeated accusation is that I am trying to relabel behavior modification into a more acceptable and vague term and sneak it back in. "Come out from behind that new facade of respectability; we know you, you behavior modificer!"

A fourth paradox involves part of the title of this Division

of Counseling and Human Development. It is the term "human" that I would focus on. A myth has grown that behaviorism and "human" concern and human involvement or humanism are antithical. An admirable paper by Carl Thoresen on Behavioral/Humanism does much to dispel this myth and yet also does one thing which perpetuates the myth. Carl points out the humanistic emphasis which many behavior modifiers identify with:

"Several reasons explain why behavior-oriented professionals see themselves this way. First of all, they focus on what the individual person does in the present life and not on who he is in terms of vague social labels or obscure descriptions. Secondly, they emphasize human problems as primarily learning situations where the person is seen as capable of changing. Thirdly, they examine how environments can be altered to reduce and prevent human problems, and, they use scientific procedures to improve techniques for helping individuals." (Thoresen, 1972, Pg. 387)

Yet, unfortunately, Carl uses the slogan of "behavioral humanism" to connote a bringing together of these two apparently disparate approches. My own biased view is that the term is redundant--a behaviorist cannot approach human behavior except in a "humanistic way."

I've run into this paradox earlier when the title of a presentation that I gave in the early 60's, "The Therapist As A Social Reinforcement Machine" (Krasner, 1962) was picked up as a "mechanistic", "simplistic", and "fascistic" example of behavior modification at work.

The classroom as a planned environment

In the context of these four paradoxes, I would like to discuss the concept of the classroom as a planned environment. The title of this paper is a slogan, a slogan around which I have been increasingly organizing my own theoretical, research, and training interests. As a slogan it has as much, or as little, meaning as other organizing slogans such as behavior modification, open education, progressive education, humanism, cognitive psychology, and a multitude of other similar slogans. Another slogan which I have been finding myself using increasingly is that of "environmental design" which refers to the training of individuals who will help design classrooms as planned environments, a good circular definition. Throughout this paper we will be utilizing the two slogans virtually interchangeably.

The purpose of this paper is to present a theoretical model of the classroom, to put the model in historical perspective, to discuss research relevant to the model, to discuss the implications of the model for subsequent application, and finally, in what I consider of most importance, the implications of training professional in the fields of psychology and education such as teachers, counselors, clinical and school psychologists, and researchers to work within the model and to influence subsequent directions of the educational process.

The model is not new; it views the classroom as a total environment planned by the teacher with advice and suggestions from students, parents, researchers, school administration, and guided by mandated

state curriculum. Implicit in such a concept are: a theory of human nature, goals as to individuals and society, a philosophy of education, specific techniques of training, and a research rationale. But a general description of the model tells very little because all models depend on a theory of human nature, a philosophy of education, with goals specified or implicit as to what is desirable individual and societal behavior. Rather than get hung up on a definition, I would like to describe the classroom as a "planned environment" in terms of the influences on and of the model, its background, and its consequences. I am emphasizing a total package rather than a specific isolated recipe in a cookbook. Primarily I will be describing an approach in its early stages and suggestions and ideas are very welcome.

Historical streams

First of all, our model must be placed within a historical context. A historical analysis is not intended as a demonstration of scholarly skill but is, itself, an integral part of a theoretical model. A major part of the theory of environmental design is that historical antecedents, paradigms, beliefs, and/or myths are major influences on the current behavior of the investigator. We will refer today to several of these streams of influence.

The behavioral stream

The first of these streams we will call the behavioral. It is placed first only because it is the one with which I am personally most familiar. Some years ago, in writing an Annual Review article on behavior therapy, I contended that at that point in the early 1970's, "behavior

therapy" or "behavior modification" represented an "uneasy alliance" between investigators in psychology, psychiatry, and education and that it was an outgrowth of the confluence of fifteen earlier streams of influence within those fields (Krasner, 1971). Thus the behavioral stream itself is highly complex.

Among the early influencers was Edward L. Thorndike. It is of interest to note that Thorndike had never even heard the word "psychology" until he took a required course in it in 1893 at Wesleyan. He was also influenced by taking a course with William James at Harvard in 1897 when he switched from literature to psychology as his major, a switch similar to one later made by Skinner, but unlikely in current times. Out of his doctoral dissertation came the law of effect. Much of Thorndike's subsequent work influenced both the behavioral stream in psychology and the applications of psychology in the classroom. His studies on learning produced considerable material useful for theories of instruction in his Principles of Teaching (1906). He offered illustrations on the topics of attention, reasoning, feeling, and moral training. He also dealt with the design and choice of teaching materials. The organization of instruction, the ways of adjusting to individual differences in the classroom and methodology judging student progress--were all involved. Cremin (1961) summarizes Thorndike's influences by indicating that, "..no aspect of public-school teaching during the first quarter of the twentieth century remained unaffected by his influence.

"Ultimately, Thorndike's goal was a comprehensive science of pedagogy in which all education could be based. His faith in quantified

methods was unbounded, and he was quoted ad nauseam to the effect that everything that exists exists in quantity and can be measured. Beginning with the notion that the methods of education could be vastly improved by science, he came slowly to the conviction that the aims, too, might well be scientifically determined" (Cremin, 1961, Pg. 114).

I have started with Thorndike rather than with more current behavioral influencers such as Skinner to emphasize that the relationship between psychological theories of behavior and the classroom is certainly not new or restricted to recent times. With only slight paraphrasing, Thorndike's linkage of learning and instructional theory to the planned environment of the classroom would still apply today. The more current "behavioral" influences can be traced to Skinner and to other investigators working with operant methodology and those influenced by it (O'Leary and O'Leary, 1972).

Many of the developments in education involving the classroom in the last decade have been influenced by this behavioral stream such as the teaching machine, programmed learning, computer-assisted instruction, the concept of behavioral objectives, behavior modification in the classroom, token economy, competency-based teacher education, concepts of accountability, peer teaching, and microteaching. Are all of these part of "environmental design in the classroom?" They can be and as such the teacher must be skillful in the use of these techniques and concepts, but by no means do these behavioral influenced developments exhaust the desired training repertoire of the planner of classroom environments.

Perhaps the most important of the behavioral techniques in their

implications for environmental design are operant conditioning, modeling, and the application of reinforcement and training principles in the form of token economies. This latter procedure, token economy, as eventually applied in classrooms and hospitals derives from the behavior modification streams of operant conditioning and utopian planning (Atthowe and Krasner, 1968; Ayllon and Azrin, 1965; Krasner and Krasner, 1973; Skinner, 1948).

Progressive stream

A second stream of influence on the concept of the classroom as a planned environment is that of American "progressive" education. Cremin's (1961) classic book on, "The Transformation of the School" traces the influence of progressivism in American education. Cremin offered as four elements in progressive education the following:

"First, it meant broadening the program and function of the school to include direct concern [illegible] health, vocation, and the quality of family and community life.

"Second, it meant applying in the classroom the pedagogical principles derived from new scientific research in psyhology and the social sciences.

"Third, it meant tailoring instruction more and more to the different kinds and classes of children who were being brought within the purview of the school.

"Finally, Progressivisism implied the radical faith that culture could be democratized without being vulgarized, the faith that everyone could share not only in the benefits of the new sciences but in the pursuit of the arts as well" (Cremin, 1961, Pg. vii, ix).

All four of these elements have fed into and influenced the environmental design approach.

Dewey's contributions are legion both in terms of his influence and the misattributions. One could cite here some of Dewey's notions of school as a community, training for democratic living, and the teacher as a social change agent (Dewey, 1916). One of the best and subtlest of statements of the philosophy of the classroom as a planned environment is the following statement from Dewey (Dworkin, 1959, Pg. 24). "The teacher is not in the school to impose certain ideas or to form certain habits in the child, but is there as a member of the community to select the influences which shall affect the child and to assist him in properly responding to these influences."

Another important stream in the development of environmental design concepts, a stream influenced by the earlier Progressive movement but also having some independent influences, particularly in some aspects of British primary education, is that of open education. Krasner and Krasner (1973) offer a conceptual linkage between the concept of open education and planned environments such as token economies. In the open classroom the teacher uses her experience and ingenuity in planning or designing 25 individual environments. In our training program we have deliberately selected the open classroom as being the most useful kind of environment in which students can observe and apply environmental design principles. The "open" approach is in process of development and people in training can both observe a process and influence it. Further, open education as a process closely links the notion of desirability of achieving valued social behavior as well as competency and skill with the notion of designing of the learning

environment to achieve these valued objectives. More and more the teacher realizes that he or she must talk in terms of goals and purposes for every design or feature that is put into the environment. Put another way, the teacher carries out a "functional analysis of behavior" in planning a classroom environment.

"Environmental" stream

Another stream leading to environmental design derives from environmental psychology (Craik, 1973; Proshansky, et al., 1970; Moos and Insel, 1974; Sommer, 1969) and ecological psychology (Barker, 1968). Although not synonymous, both of these fields are concerned with the influence of physical settings on behavior. As Roger Barker puts it, "We found, in short, that we could predict some aspects of children's behavior more adequately from knowledge of the behavior characteristics of the drugstores, arithmetic classes, and basketball games they inhabited than from knowledge of the behavior tendencies of particular children." (Barker, 1968, p4) The systematic application of architectural design to affect behavior also falls within this stream, and it is interesting to note the recent usage of the term "environmental design" as a proposed improvement on the term "architecture."

The training of the environmental designer

A major element in the training of environmental designers is the exposure to a number of streams of influence which are relevant to the activities in which designers will be engaged professionally (Krasner and Hutchison, 1974). As a sample of these areas, we offer the following list of topics covered in our ongoing and evolving seminar on "environmental

design", for both undergraduate psychology majors and graduate doctoral students, via readings, discussions, and presentations by visitors; environmental design as an extension of behavior modification; the classroom as a planned environment; research as both an environmental design and a behavior influence; the token economy as a planned environment; economic principles as influences in the classroom, the mental hospital and in society; the architectural arrangement of space as an influence on behavior; the social role of behavior-change agent; the occupational career of environmental designer; social and ethical implications of environmental design; the consequences of demography on planning environments; the design and function of community mental health centers; planned societies, utopias or people designing their own environments; social and behavioral change in China; and civil liberties, social justice, and other worthy goals of environmental design.

Admittedly this is a broad range of topics and material, yet we feel that these are but a start in the direction of considering what variables must be considered in training professional environmental designers. Our aim is to develop a general approach to training people involved in designing environments that can be utilized in any social setting, be it a school, a hospital, a community center, or a home, although thus far we have been focusing upon the classroom.

Procedures

This section describes some of the procedures which have been developing within the environmental design program, none of which are new in and of themselves. However, each is a product of the environmental

design model. Training in these procedures consists of developing them rather than just learning a fixed technique. Therefore they are not to be seen simply as end-products to be imitated (although they may be useful in the proper context), but as illustrations of how the theory is translated into practice. The students in the seminar are serving as participant-observers in open classrooms in a local school system. Their task is to observe how the teacher plans his or her environment including how the participant-observer is used.

The participant-observer role (P-O)

The role of participant-observer was developed as a means of training students in the concepts and applications of environmental design for our purposes. This role is central in the development of a strategy for research and training. It was developed to fulfill a number of goals: (a) to test the model of undergraduate-level consultants in environmental design; (b) to develop a role in which a person can function as observer in a natural, complex environment; (c) to apply theory in changing the natural environment and observing the consequences of those changes; (d) to train those who control the environment--in this case teachers--in applying principles of behavior to the design of the environment; (e) to train students to do this training, application, and observation.

The participant-observer role was chosen rather than the more traditional observer role for several reasons. In making changes in the environment, the person is always a participant, an influencer; in many environments a participant is less obtrusive than an observer; by participating, the person has more access to information from the environment

and its other participants; a participant can engage in activities that reinforce the teacher (in this instance) such as helping; and finally, it represents a sharp movement away from the myth of the existance of "objective" value-free observers.

The participant-observers are advanced psychology majors enrolled for a year in a seminar in environmental design. The theory and practical problems are discussed in the weekly seminar meetings, and the students participant as P-O's in elementary classrooms (and more recently in mental hospital ward) one morning per week. Open classrooms from a local school district were selected for the initial program as examples of planned environments. The process of contacts with prospective co-operating teachers and principles was utilized in the training program as illustrative of the problems and opportunities inherent in such contacts.

The actual role behaviors of the P-O's were not well defined beforehand, either to the teachers or to the students. This provided a process by which teachers and P-O's could develop the role and provided flexibility across diverse classroom situations. This lack of definition resulted in more creative and useful roles than could have been planned beforehand.

Initially most P-O's generally circulated through the room helping individuals and small groups with assignments and projects. Later on, many develop mini-lessons, organize areas of the room, and bring in materials from the outside. As they become more familiar with the environment and as the seminar material exerts its influence, their roles continue to develop.

Journals

In setting up the original school program, a way was needed to get input from the students about their classrooms and activities and to help them systematize their experiences. The method chosen was the use of journals in which each P-O was required to record observations and comments from his day in school immediately following that period. The recording was to be done after rather than during the session in keeping with the role of participant-observer rather than observer.

As with the roles of P-O and trainer, we left unstructured the content to be recorded, which resulted in a wide variety of styles. Based on the journals of the P-O's in the first year, we took the useful types of observations made, added other categories from theory, and arrived at "A Guide to Observation in the Classroom" with 38 different observations under categories such as Explicit and Implicit Rules, Learned Roles and their Consequences, Physical Materials, and so on. The P-O's are, of course, not expected to observe all the categories every week, but they are to generally let the list guide what they record (therefore tending to guide what they observe).

Both P-O's and trainers keep journals which are available to each other as an efficient way to transmit information and feedback. The diaries are also a useful resource for orientation of new participant-observers to the classrooms they will be entering, and a ready source for gathering data. For example, a project involved the application of Flanagan's critical incidence technique utilizing the journals as source material in order to determine desirable P-O behavior.

The human behavior lab

A third grade teacher in an open wing wanted to train pupils in her classroom to be effective observers and to improve social interaction skills. She suggested that a Human Behavior Lab be established in the wing (Krasner, Ford, Harpin, and Krasner, 1975). A graduate student working with the trainer for the school developed the structure of the weekly sessions. They broke the subject area into topics and used materials based on their own creativity, on behavior influence techniques on the group dynamics literature, on open education principles, and on materials from similar projects. The initial lab began with children who volunteered for the project.

The particular skill areas covered include self-observation, observation of others in the group, in the classroom, outside the classroom, and at home; teaching a mini-lesson to other children in their class; and finally taking over the teaching of the next group of children in the lab. The children were taught to observe behavior as well as its consequences, especially in social interaction situations. Specific devices and techniques used include mirrors and tape recorders for self-observation; self-monitoring, modeling, role-playing, social reinforcement, and games (revived or invented) to illustrate points (e.g., "gossip" to illustrate distortion in giving and receiving information).

The effect on the behavior of the four children in the group and on the other children in the class was assessed by questionnaires to the teachers and parents and taped interviews with the children. Outcomes achieved with this group of children included improved social skills

and group functioning for all the children, improved status of at least one low-status child within the classroom, skill in teaching other children, and an understanding of "psychology."

This human behavior lab represents a translation of environmental design principles to the training of young children to observe and influence their own environment. In effect, the lab is a prototype of the entire program demonstrating that even quite young children can learn to design their own environments so as to elicit positive responses from adults and peers.

Animal behavior lab

One of the teachers in a fifth grade class always kept a number of animals in the classroom, and her adept cage-building added to the attraction of the animals for the children. At the time a human behavior lab was being considered for another class in the same wing, she saw an animal behavior lab as a logical complement. She began the planning with an experienced P-O who had background doing animal experimentation and access to equipment from the university.

The lab had a number of relatively sophisticated goals. The main emphasis was on observing how learning occurs in animals and the relation of this kind of learning to human situations. The children learned how the empirical methods of science work in real situations, and through experience learned the importance of planning designs, controlling extraneous variables, and drawing careful inferences. With repeated experimentation, the pupils learned the full range of behavioral terms and how they apply in many situations. One student, after hearing

the leader explain the concept of relative value of reinforcement in terms of delay and magnitude of reward, clarified it by saying, "You see, the rat decides which is the better deal."

After an initial explanation of the problem to be studied, the leader worked with the children to determine a reasonable strategy for running the experiment. The students quickly became proficient at setting up apparatus, delivering reinforcements, operating Guillotine doors, and keeping time, and they cautioned each other about disturbing the experiment with noise and movement.

The experiments completed have included standard rat experiments such as discrimination learning with T-mazes and jumping stands, and a "self-control" analog study. During the twice-weekly sessions which were open to volunteers from this class and to others in the wing, the participants learned to look at behavior in a way that may provide a model, albeit a "behavioral" one, which may serve them as explanation for problems they will encounter in their experience.

Children designing their own classrooms

When changes are indicated in the design of a classroom, it is a temptation, even to environmental designers, to implement changes themselves, using the best of environmental design principles. In one case this urge was resisted with excellent results. The P-O in a sixth grade classroom, under the influence of seminar readings and a semester of observation, suggested to the teacher the possibility of changes from the one-desk-per-student plan in order to encourage movement and usage of interest centers. The teacher encouraged the idea, having heard in a

class on open education that open classrooms should have less than one desk per student.

In a training team meeting, the P-O brought up the problem and the suggestion was made to have the children set up an experiment including data-taking. In the classroom, most of the children agreed to set up the study. Those not interested were accommodated by allowing them to keep their own desks. Immediately there was much greater movement in the room which increased the demand on the interest centers. Extending the process to the next step, the teacher suggested that the children provide input toward redesigning the interest centers.

The P-O and several of the students began moving things in one interest center. Soon many children in the class were participating in major redesigning of the area. Other areas were attacked with creative and increasinglt sophisticated vigor, almost completely child-initiated, and experimentation in classroom designing became a way of life. The children, the teacher, and other visiting teachers were all quite pleased by the outcome, undoubtedly more than if they had planned many of the changes themselves.

The children learned by practice to design their own environments. By careful observation and even some data-taking, they were able to see the influence of the physical environment on their own behavior. By having the responsibility of planning, they learned ways of behaviors affecting their environment that should be useful to them in their future.

Implications

The most important implication of these procedures is that they are a process of training people to conceptualize the environment in which

they are working in such a way they can apply the general principles of environmental design. Succinctly stated, some of these principles include:

(a) a hypothesized model of human behavior which sees the locus of influence in the environment and not in a hypothesized entity within the individual;

(b) an individual learns by observing and by doing;

(c) behavior followed by a rewarding event is likely to be repeated;

(d) any situation can be analyzed so that the planner can set up specific behavioral goals that are socially desirable, taking into consideration both social and individual needs and desires;

(e) the sources of social influence are wide and complex, but analyzable;

(f) techniques should not be developed in isolation but only in the context of learning environments with which the individual designer is dealing. The broader influences on behavior such as social roles and the impact of institutional rituals and restraint must be considered;

(g) the professional influencer is part of the influence process itself. As such, he must be aware of and, to the extent possible, in control of the influences on him.

A major point which derives from the social psychological or social learning model is that the goal of helping individuals is to enable them to learn how to control, influence, or design their own environment.

Implicit in this is a value judgment that individual freedom is a desirable goal and the more an individual is able to affect his environment, the greater is his freedom. It should be clear at this point that what we mean by "environment" is both the people and physical objects in one's life.

In dealing with people, we are involved in an influence process that is ubiquitous and not limited to curing or helping "unfortunates" (Krasner and Ullmann, 1973). By this model, everyone is involved in designing environments. The individual who seeks help, the therapist, the researcher, the schoolteacher, the parent, the student. The question which intrigues us, how to train the environmental designer, could be interpreted to mean, "How do you train people to live in our society?" The reader can and should contribute to this process by asking him or herself, "What kind of a world do I want to live in and what can I do to help influence society at least a bit in that direction?"

We will conclude with the goals of our program which usually should have come first, but we love paradoxes.. The goals themselves are an integral part of the influence process. In training people to approach the classroom as a planned environment, as environmental designers, our goals are as follows:

(1) To influence professionals in a variety of current fields such as clinical psychology, counseling psychology, school psychology, guidance, education, social work, and psychiatry, and related fields such as architecture, law, and economics so that these people view their role as <u>social change agents</u> working within a broad social learning environment, theoretical, and philosophic framework. Put in somewhat different terms, we want to train

people to influence their clients as (Walden Two) Fraziers of their own. Another slogan would be, "Every person his own Frazier." I know that many people and institutions have wrestled with the problem, whether there should be separate programs to specifically train behavior modifiers, behavior analysts, or environmental designers. My feeling is against this, preferring primarily to influence the ideas and techniques of those trained in nice "traditional" social roles.

(2) To influence the development of the social learning model into the logical extension of social and environmental planning and training for more equitable societies. The concept of the classroom as a planned environment links what happens in the classroom (the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors which are being shaped) with the outside world and with the kind of community the children will then, themselves, develop and shape. That this goal is optimistic as well as consistent with theorists such as Dewey and Skinner, we have indicated earlier.

(3) To influence the direction of research on the classroom so that there is greater awareness and desirability of the linkage of research and social implications of the research. The impact of the participant-observer researcher on the outcome, the intricate interweaving of research and ethics of research --all these are topics of current concern and involvement and growing sensitivity to implications. The point is that we should no longer conceive of research on the classroom, or for that matter, on any other aspect of human behavior as a separate professional function--the role of the scientist as objective and unbiased, divorced from the battle is no longer viable.

(4) To influence the development of community centers analogous in many ways to the growth of teacher centers. I am not referring to community mental health centers. If I made anything clear, I would hope it is that the model of the classroom as a planned environment eschews the health-illness dichotomy of the pathology model. Rather, the community center would represent a community linkage between the activities of the environmental designer and the individuals in the community whom he or she will influence such as parents, teachers, and individuals with a wide variety of social, economic, and personal concerns.

(5) It should certainly be clear that many professional individuals share these goals. I would hope for considerable interaction and sharing of ideas among these people. This does not call for new kinds of professional organizations--there are enough of those already--but rather the development of informal networks via correspondence, newsletters, and informal, mini-workshops, the growth of teacher and community centers, and particularly contacts between those of diverse backgrounds but working within the same model with similar goals.

I will conclude with a final historical perspective. Even though we cited a long history that feeds into the concept of the classroom as a planned environment, we must begin to think in long range terms. We are not at the culmination of a historical process but only at the very beginning.

References

Atthowe, J. M., Jr., and Krasner, L. A preliminary report on the application of contingent reinforcement procedures (token economy on a "chronic" psychiatric ward). Journal of abnormal psychology, 1968, 73, 37-43.

Ayllon, T. and Azrin, N. H. The measurement and reinforcement of behavior of psychotics. Journal of the experimental analysis of behavior, 1965, 8, 357-383.

Barker, R. Ecological psychology. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1968.

Craik, K. H. Environmental psychology. Annual review of psychology. Annual Reviews, Stanford, California, 1973.

Cremin, L. A. The transformation of the school: Progressivism in American education 1876-1957. New York: Knopf, 1961.

Dewey, J. Democracy and education. New York: Macmillan, 1916.

Dworkin, M. S. (Ed.). Dewey on education. New York: Teachers College Press, 1959.

Krasner, L. The therapist as a social reinforcement machine. In H. H. Strupp and L. Luborsky (Eds.), Research in psychotherapy, Vol. 2. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association, 1962.

Krasner, L. Behavior therapy. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Annual review of psychology, Vol. 22. Palo Alto, Cal.: Annual Reviews, 1971.

Krasner, L., Ford, J., Harpin, E., and Krasner, M. The human behavior lab. Unpublished manuscript. State University of New York at Stony Brook, New York, 1975.

Krasner, L. and Hutchison, W. H. Environmental design. Unpublished manuscript. State University of New York at Stony Brook, New York, 1974.

Krasner, L. and Krasner, M. Token economies and other planned environments. In C. L. Thoresen (Ed.), Behavior modification in education. National Society for the Study of Education, 72nd Yearbook. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Krasner, L. and Ullmann, L. P. Behavior influence and personality: The social matrix of human action. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Moos, R. H. and Insel, P. M. (Eds.). Issues in social ecology. Palo Alto, Cal.: National Press Books, 1974.

O'Leary, K. D. and O'Leary, S. G. (Eds.). Classroom management. New York: Pergamon, 1972.

Proshansky, H. W., Ittelson, W. H., and Rivlin, L. G. (Eds.). Environmental psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Skinner, B. F. Walden two. New York: Macmillan, 1948.

Sommer, R. Personal space. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Thoresen, C. E. Behavioral humanism. In C. E. Thoresen (Ed.), Behavior modification in education. National Society for the Study of Education, 72nd Yearbook. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.